On the Systematic Illogicality of Humanity
A Treatise

Preamble
This treatise does not seek to prove that humanity is irrational. This has been stated many times and each time the statement was absorbed by the very system it attempted to describe. This treatise poses a different question why does the species Homo sapiens, possessing sufficient cognitive resources to identify, analyze, and resolve its fundamental problems, systematically fail to do so and, moreover, fail to pose this very question as a central one? This is not a rhetorical question. It is a research question one that, as will be shown, has no institutional home within the existing structure of knowledge.

Part I. The Observation
1.1. What Is Visible
Humanity possesses
Science capable of splitting the atom and decoding the genome
Technology capable of sending a human beyond the planet
Communication systems connecting billions in real time
Mathematical models describing processes from the subatomic to the cosmological scale
Accumulated historical experience spanning millennia of documented trial and error
Simultaneously, humanity
Wages wars despite exhaustive knowledge of their destructiveness
Accelerates ecological degradation despite detailed understanding of its mechanisms and consequences
Reproduces systemic deception in political and economic institutions despite documented understanding of its corrosive effects on the social fabric
Structurally maintains inequality that generates instability, despite economic data on the advantages of more equitable resource distribution

These are not episodic failures. This is not the result of insufficient knowledge. This is a systematic, reproducible, cross cultural, and cross historical pattern.

1.2. What Is Not Visible

What is not visible is more significant than what is visible. There is no discipline that studies this pattern as a whole. There is no department, no journal, no research program, no grant fund dedicated to the question why does a species capable of understanding its problems systematically fail to solve them? Cognitive psychology studies individual biases. Evolutionary biology studies adaptive limitations. Sociology studies structural reproduction. Philosophy studies the boundaries of reason. Systems science studies complexity. Each sees its fragment. No one sees the whole. And no one studies the fact that no one sees the whole. This absence is not accidental. It is structural. And it is part of the phenomenon it conceals.

Part II. The Structure of Fragmentation

2.1. The Room Principle

The existing structure of knowledge can be described through the metaphor of rooms in a building without a corridor. Each discipline is a room. Inside each room, rigorous work is conducted observations are made, hypotheses are tested, data is accumulated. Each room has its own language, its own criteria of rigor, its own standards of evidence. But there is no corridor. There is no space from which one could see all the rooms simultaneously and ask what is the building as a whole? Moreover, the very question what is the building as a whole? does not belong to any room. It is not a question of physics, biology, sociology, or philosophy. It is a question about the structure of knowledge itself and this question has no institutional home.

2.2. Why the Corridor Does Not Exist

The absence of a corridor is not a design flaw that no one has noticed. It is a self maintaining property of the system. The mechanism operates as follows:

1. Each discipline defines the boundaries of its questions
2. A question that exceeds the boundaries of all disciplines simultaneously belongs to none of them

3. A question belonging to no discipline has no institutional subject no one to ask it professionally, no one to fund its investigation, nowhere to publish the results
4. The absence of research is perceived as the absence of a problem
5. The absence of a problem confirms that the existing structure is sufficient
6. The existing structure reproduces itself including the absence of a corridor

This cycle is closed and self sustaining. It requires no external agent for its reproduction though it does not preclude the existence of one.

2.3. Historical Attempts to Build a Corridor

Throughout documented history, attempts have been made to create an integrative framework of knowledge a corridor connecting the rooms. Each such attempt has been neutralized through one of three mechanisms

Encapsulation. The integrative approach is transformed into yet another specialized discipline, losing its integrative function.

Marxism began as a synthesis of economics, history, philosophy, and sociology and became a separate ideological system with its own boundaries

Cybernetics was conceived as a universal science of control and became a narrow technical discipline

Systems analysis was proposed as a method for overcoming disciplinary boundaries and became a separate discipline with its own boundaries

Marginalization. The integrative approach is pushed to the periphery of the academic field, retaining formal existence but losing influence.

Philosophy in antiquity the central discipline integrating all forms of knowledge in the modern university a marginal department with no influence on the natural and social sciences

General systems theory recognized but not applied as an integrative framework

Complex thinking Morin influential within a narrow circle, virtually unknown beyond it

Discreditation. The integrative attempt is assigned to the category of the unscientific, the unserious, or the dangerous.

Any attempt to raise the question of systemic civilizational illogicality risks being labeled conspiracy theory regardless of the quality of argumentation
Holistic approaches are marked as alternative, which in the academic context is a form of discreditation
Questions about structural causes are often marked as ideological, placing them outside objective science
These three mechanisms are not mutually exclusive and often operate sequentially first the attempt is encapsulated, then the encapsulated version is marginalized, and the non encapsulated remnants are discredited.

Part III. The Phenomenon
3.1. Civilizational Cognitive Discrepancy
We propose to designate the described phenomenon with the term Civilizational Cognitive Discrepancy CCD a sustained, reproducible mismatch between the cognitive potential of the species Homo sapiens and the actual application of that potential at the level of civilizational organization.
CCD differs from individual cognitive biases described by Kahneman and Tversky in three parameters
Scale CCD manifests not at the level of individual decisions but at the level of civilizational processes
Persistence individual biases can be corrected through training and institutional design CCD reproduces itself despite the existence of knowledge about it and institutions designed to correct it
Reflexivity CCD includes the inability of civilization to pose the question of its own illogicality as a central one that is, the phenomenon contains within itself the mechanism of its own invisibility
3.2. The Invisibility Mechanism
The most significant property of CCD is not its existence but its invisibility. The phenomenon is not hidden. It is not classified. It is not suppressed by censorship. It is structurally invisible in the same way that a fish does not see water not because the water is hidden, but because it is the medium in which the fish exists. The disciplinary structure of knowledge is the water. CCD is the question about the water. And the fish each individual researcher,

each department, each journal does not see the water because it is the condition of their existence. This is not a metaphor. This is a description of an institutional mechanism. A researcher who wishes to study CCD professionally discovers that

There is no department where this could be done

There is no journal that would publish such research

There is no grant fund that would finance it

There is no academic career path that would lead through this question

Colleagues would classify such research as too broad, insufficiently rigorous, or not our field

Each of these responses is individually rational. Taken together, they form a system that structurally prevents the posing of the central question.

Part IV. The Question of Causality

4.1. Two Interpretations

This treatise records the existence of a pattern but does not assert its cause. At least two interpretations are possible

Interpretation A Emergent. The fragmentation of knowledge is an unintended result of organic development. Specialization increases efficiency within each domain but creates blind spots between domains. The self maintenance of fragmentation is an emergent property of a complex system, requiring no external agent.

Interpretation B Functional. The fragmentation of knowledge performs a function within a broader system maintaining the stability of existing social, economic, and political structures by preventing holistic reflection. A holistic view of civilization is dangerous to those structures that extract benefit from the existing order.

Both interpretations are compatible with the observed data. They are not mutually exclusive a system can be simultaneously emergent in origin and functional in result.

4.2. Why the Distinction May Not Matter

For practical purposes, the distinction between interpretations A and B may be less significant than it appears. In both cases, CCD reproduces itself. In both cases, its holistic investigation is blocked. In both cases,

conscious effort is required to overcome this blockage. Whether the wall is built by an architect or formed by geological processes if you need to pass through, you must deal with the wall, not with the question of its origin. This treatise deals with the wall.

Part V. The Implications

5.1. For Science

If CCD is a real phenomenon, then the existing structure of science is not merely imperfect but structurally incapable of posing the most important question about the species it studies. This does not devalue existing science but it establishes its boundary. And this boundary is not at the edge of knowledge but at its center.

5.2. For Education

The disciplinary structure of the university reproduces fragmentation in each new generation. A student is trained to think within a discipline the skill of thinking between disciplines is not merely unformed but actively suppressed by the demands of specialization. If CCD is real, then the education system is a mechanism for its reproduction not through malice but through structure.

5.3. For Decision Making

Global problems climate, inequality, conflicts are metadisciplinary by nature. They cannot be solved within the framework of a single discipline. But the institutional structure of decision making reproduces disciplinary division economists advise on economics, ecologists on ecology, military experts on security. A holistic view is not institutionalized.

5.4. For Understanding the Human Condition

If CCD is real, then the question why can't humanity solve its problems? receives a new answer not because the problems are too complex, and not because people are too stupid, but because the structure of knowledge about these problems is organized in such a way that prevents posing the question about them as a whole. This is simultaneously a more pessimistic and a more optimistic answer than the usual ones. More pessimistic because it means the obstacle is structural, not episodic. More optimistic because a structural obstacle, once identified, can be addressed structurally.

Part VI. This Treatise as a Test

This treatise is not only a description of a phenomenon. It is a test for the presence of that phenomenon. If CCD is real and the mechanisms of encapsulation, marginalization, and discreditation operate as described, then the reaction to this treatise is predictable

It will be classified as philosophy encapsulation

It will be deemed not rigorous enough for any specific discipline marginalization

It will be labeled too broad, speculative, or conspiratorial discreditation

Each of these reactions, should it occur, will be additional empirical evidence confirming the described pattern. If, however, the treatise provokes substantive discussion discussion of the phenomenon itself rather than of the disciplinary affiliation of the text this will be evidence that the pattern, while real, is not absolute. That a corridor can be built. We record this circumstance consciously, transforming a potential weakness of the text into an element of its methodology.

Conclusion

This treatise has recorded the existence of a phenomenon that we have designated as Civilizational Cognitive Discrepancy a systematic, reproducible mismatch between the cognitive potential of humanity and its application at the civilizational level. It has been shown that

1. CCD is recorded fragmentarily across several disciplines but is not investigated as a holistic phenomenon in any of them
2. Historical attempts to create integrative knowledge frameworks are systematically neutralized through mechanisms of encapsulation, marginalization, and discreditation
3. The disciplinary structure of knowledge possesses the property of reflexive self protection it reproduces the conditions under which the question of its own fragmentation cannot be posed as legitimate

This treatise does not claim to provide the final answer. It claims to pose the question and asserts that the very

absence of this question at the center of scientific and civilizational discourse is part of the phenomenon it describes. The question is posed. What happens next is data.